

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-30 and 32-35 are currently pending in the application. Claims 4-6, 22 and 33 are allowed.

Claim 17 stands objected to because of an antecedent basis problem, which has been addressed by amendment herein.

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, 28, 29, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,297,353 (Ghalayini). Claims 15-19, 21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,231,393 (Strickland). Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103 as obvious over Ghalayini in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,375 (Davis).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-11, 13-24, 26-30, 34 and 35 is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to characterize the proximity sensor as detecting the presence of an individual or object spaced from the message system at the first side of the wall.

That which the Examiner relies upon for the proximity sensor is the element 66, which is an internal mechanism for automatically and repeatedly changing signals each time a screw passes by the sensor.

On the other hand, by reason of being spaced from the message system, an object or individual walking up to the message system at the first side of the wall would cause the message generator to make a message viewable from the first side of the wall. Applicant respectfully submits that the concept of continuously changing the state of the display each time an iron screw passes a sensor does not suggest to, or motivate, someone skilled in

the art, to modify the system to arrive at the structure in claim 1. Claim 1 is thus believed allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 7-11, 14, 16 and 17 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the cited art.

As just examples, claim 11 characterizes the information as providing a direction to an observer of the message to assist navigation of a space within which the message system is located. There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of a message of this nature.

Claim 14 recites a transmitter/generator that can be carried by a user for directing a signal to the message generator from a location space from the message generator. Ghalayini does not teach or suggest such a transmitter/generator.

Claim 16 characterizes the wall as having a thickness and at least a part of the signal generator as residing within the thickness of the wall. Again, the art does not teach or suggest such a limitation.

Claims 13 and 24 have been amended to characterize the mirrored surface as having a convex shape that is in the shape of a segment of a sphere. Ghalayini does not teach or suggest any such structure.

Claim 15 and 27 have been amended to characterize the wall and message generator as defining a subassembly at a first location relative to which the wheeled vehicle is spaced and can be moved. Further, claim 15 characterizes the wall as having a mirrored surface which is capable of producing a discernible, reflective image of an object placed at the first side of the wall.

Strickland does not teach or suggest a wheeled vehicle that is spaced from and movable relative to a message generator. Strickland only coincidentally includes wheels to facilitate relocation of the entire assembly.

Claim 18 characterizes the wall as having a mirrored surface, with a camera located to create an image of an object on one side of the wall with the camera on the other side. Strickland does not teach or suggest this structure, let alone anticipate it as argued by the Examiner.

Claim 19 recites a wall with a mirrored surface, with an object at the first side of the wall viewable through the wall from the second side of the wall.

Strickland, relied upon as allegedly anticipating this claim, does not teach or suggest a corresponding mirrored surface.

Claim 20 has been amended similarly to claim 1 and is believed allowable for the same reasons set forth relative to the allowability of claim 1.

Claims 22, 23, 26, 28 and 29 each depends from claim 20 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the art.

As just examples, claim 23 characterizes the message as comprising information providing a direction to an observer of the message at the first side of the wall to assist navigation of a space within which the message system is located.

Claim 26 recites a transmitter/generator that can be carried by a user.

Claim 21 characterizes the wall as blocking viewing of an object at the second side of the wall through the wall from the first side while allowing an object on the first side of the wall to be viewed through the wall from the second side.

Strickland does not teach or suggest such a structure.

Claim 30 characterizes the message generator as having first and second states in which the message generator generates the message in first and second different languages.

The Examiner relies upon Davis in rejecting this claim. While Davis teaches that a message can be generated in a foreign language, there is no disclosure that a message generator may have different states which allows the message to be generated selectively in different languages.

Claim 34 has been amended to characterize the transmitter/generator as carried by a user for directing a signal to the message generator from the location spaced from the message generator with the user stationary at a location spaced from the message generator.

This language further characterizes the language that is already in claim 34. Ghalayini does not teach or suggest any type of transmitter/generator that can be carried, or operated, by a user.

Claim 35 characterizes the message as comprising information providing a direction to an observer of the message to assist navigation of a space within which the message system is located.

As noted above, none of the prior art teaches or suggests a message generator for producing information that assists navigation of a space within which the message system is located.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-11, 13-24, 26-30, 34 and 35 and allowance of the case are requested.


Respectfully submitted,

By

  
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,  
CLARK & MORTIMER  
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 876-1800

Date:

  
July 19, 2005